

SS Advocate
ZION'S HERALD AND WESLEYAN JOURNAL.

Published by the Boston Wesleyan Association for the New England Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church.
Vol. XVII. { A. STEVENS, EDITOR. FRANKLIN RAND, Agent.
BOSTON AND PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1846. TERMS, \$2.00 IN ADVANCE. OFFICE OVER No. 1 Cornhill. No. 52.

ON THE DEATH OF REV. GEORGE PICKERING.
BY REV. AMOS WALTON.

I've seen thee oft—I see thee still
As once thou stoodst on Zion's hill,
A conquering chieftain, firm and bold,
Clad in thy gospel armor bright,
To meet the rebel sons of night,
Stronger than they a thousand fold.

I saw thee oft—I see thee still,
But not upon the battle-hill,
With helmet, buckler, shield and sword;
For death, thy foe, a friend hath come,
A messenger to call the home
To Jesus, thy all-conquering Lord.

I saw thee oft—I see thee still,
Thy presence comes without the will,
But choice detains my welcome guest;
I listen to thy notes of praise,
Which lips immortal ever raise
In thy eternal land of rest.

I see thee now a conqueror crowned,
Midst hosts of conquerors clustering round,
And foremost in that shining crowd;
I see thy conquerors here in arms,
With crowns of life, and conquering palms,
They raise the song of triumph loud.

Wesley and Fletcher press thee near,
Coke, Clark, and Watson too, appear,
And all the English Wesleyan band
Whom God hath called from earth away,
To their reward in endless day,
With those of every age and land.

To see thee Ashby shouts anew,
McKendree, George, and Roberts too,
Whitcomb, and Emory, Fisk, and Lee,
Ostrander, Merritt, all unite
To welcome thee to realms of light,
Thine, veteran, sainted Pickering, these.

I saw thy sacred house of clay
Laid where the living host must stay,
Until the trump of God shall sound;
Then, rising from its dusty bed,
With Christ, our risen, glorious head,
May we, who live, with thee be found.

We saw thee oft, but never more
Shall we behold thee on the shore
Of time, where still we toil and fight;
But soon the heralds of the cross
Who now for Christ count all things loss,
Shall dwell with thee in realms of light.
Oxford, Dec. 14.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTER FROM PROF. DEMPSTER.

Theological School at Didsbury—Remarks—Its Location—Library—Dr. Hannah—Rev. Mr. Bowers—Dinner Scene.

The rapid survey we took in our last of the school of the prophets in England, was restricted chiefly to the branch in Richmond. In continuing that sketch, we shall here glance at that in Didsbury. It is located in this section of the kingdom, to accommodate that part of the working remote from Richmond. While one of these becomes a convenient centre of the South, the other is auspiciously located in the North.—These positions, respectively central to the two extremes of the kingdom, were selected to furnish equal facilities of access to each of them.—It is only under the influence of special circumstances that candidates are sent from the vicinity of the one to the halls of the other. This only occurs when dictated by the state of their social or domestic relations, or some other kindred peculiarity. The two branches are supposed to share alike in the number of students, and to afford equal advantages to them. None are allowed to enter either branch but such as shall have been admitted to probationary membership in the Conference; and this relation to Conference must be preceded by the most scrupulous examination. Every element of character is analyzed and inspected; their experience as Christians, their divine call to the sacred office, their mental capacity to discharge its functions, their capability and habits of application, and the fruit that has sealed their incipient ministry.—On all these attributes of character, the proper authorities of the church sit in the sternest judgment, and only those are admitted to the institution who satisfactorily pass this severe ordeal.

In demanding, as an indispensable condition, proof of a divine call to the ministry, this institution is unique. All other institutions admit candidates before they have satisfied the church, by the fruit of their ministry, that God has called them to that office. It must appear, to the most common observer, that this requisition, at the very threshold, is a most momentous guard against a merely learned ministry. Surely an institution which admits none who have not evident evidence of God's call to the ministry, cannot be honestly charged with an attempt to make ministers. It cannot be alleged that it would substitute education for grace, a mental training for a divine call, or that it exhibits a show of interference with God's prerogative to select and anoint his servants.

While it claims a powerful agency in bestowing that class of qualifications which all agree are to be acquired, it never attempts to intermeddle with that other class which are derived immediately from God. It was on this broad and solid ground that the Wesleyans vindicated their institution against the terrible charges which ignorance and prejudice culminated against it.—The flood of light which they poured on the public mind, showing the harmony between the institution and the genius of Methodism, either convinced or confounded those who had clamored most loudly against it. There was no part of the kingdom which we traversed, where this result of that spirited discussion was not obvious.—Every where the enemies of the enterprise were vanquished, and its friends were reposing in a complete triumph.

The location of this northern branch is within a few miles of Manchester. Its proximity to that great and rapidly expanding town is a source of advantages which a remote country place could never furnish. It is true, it has nothing like the enchanting scenery, the lovely landscape, of Richmond. It stands in the midst of a fertile region, but the surface is almost a dead level. Nature has given it not a feature of variety.—All its enjoyments have been furnished by art—the houses that wealth has adorned, and the groves that taste has planted. Nor will the seminary building itself compare in magnificence with that of the Southern branch. It may have no less conveniences, but it is certainly inferior in elegance. In the same yard are two well finished dwellings for the Professors, each standing at opposite sides of a beautiful little chapel. The yard

itself, encircled with shrubbery, and blooming with flowers, added much to the appearance of neatness and comfort by which the buildings are distinguished.

The library of this branch has recently been enriched by an accession of most valuable works. It now contains the Greek and Latin fathers, many of the choicest productions of the last three centuries, and some of the best works of the intervening ages. The course of studies is classified in two general divisions—the theological and the classical. In the latter, are taught the Latin, Greek and Hebrew, with most other academical branches. The theological tutor performs most of his labors by delivering lectures. These comprise natural theology, the evidences and doctrines of the Bible, pastoral theology, the principles of interpretation, and the history of the Bible.

The plan of merging so much in lectures, did not strike us as being unexceptionable. Though the stipuli required the next day to answer questions carefully prepared on the contents of the lecture, it does not require, on his part, that intense application requisite to recite in a strictly elemental text book. It occurred to us, that as the disciplining of the mind by thinking, was certainly not less important than the replenishing of it with thought, to a learner there can be no substitute for close application.

Rev. Mr. Thornton, with his assistant, manages all that belongs to the classical division, and does it, too, with distinguished ability. To Dr. Hannah, is confided all that appertains to the theological department. The Dr. and his place seem to have been made for each other. Perhaps the whole connection could not have furnished one who could have better supplied it. The brightest attributes of character which are found in Mr. Jackson, at Richmond, in a high degree shine in Dr. H. Were his pupils not to esteem him, it would betray their incapacity to appreciate a literary and well disciplined mind. Were they not to love him, it would indicate them unresponsive of the benevolent emotions. There is scarcely extant a criticism on the originals of the Scriptures of which the Dr. cannot give you an able opinion. Nor is there a distinguished author on any branch of his department, whose contents he seems not to have grasped.

But what most interested us in the Dr., was the union of so much manly strength, with the most child-like simplicity—an exhaustless wealth of intellect, with a ceaseless gush of kind affection.—It was delightful to observe the reciprocity in paternal and filial affection, between this tutor and his pupils. Indeed, we found that the sweetness of his temper, and the exuberance of his sympathy, had given the power of a charm to his very name, to all with whom, in by-gone years, he had associated. In addition to these three teachers, the institution has a governor.—Whatever appertains to the boarding hall, is entirely under his control. He is the father of the family. He supplies the table, directs the evening and morning devotions, meets the young men in their weekly class, and promotes, by all possible means, their spiritual growth. The present governor is Rev. Mr. Bowers, a Wesleyan minister. No motive would have allured him from the itinerancy, but for the partial failure of his health. That was the sphere in which the powers of his eloquence left him second to few in the connection. That eloquence which so glowed in his overflowing congregations, is now thrilling these future itinerants. This living power will exert on them an influence, long after their departure from that sacred hall.

At our second visit, this gentleman invited us to dinner. We found the tutors, some visiting ministers, and about thirty pupils at the table. Most of the young men appeared in perfect health, with cheeks blooming in that crimson hue which belongs to the face of an Englishman. In their dress they were neat but very plain. The keen eye and broad manly forehead of some of them foretold their future eminence. In their simplicity and gracefulness of manner, we could not remain at a loss who was their model. The quality of the dinner, the appearance of the dining room, and the character of the company, were in striking accordance.

Dinner being finished, the governor addressed us. He reminded his friends that one of their guests was from the new world, and congratulated them on having such a one, especially as his pursuit was kindred to their own. This address displayed eminent tact. It was so ingeniously framed to elicit our response, that neither the stranger or the tutors could quit the table in silence. So the former sprang from his seat, and after glancing at the two-fold object which brought him to the old world, he turned an eye to the great purposes of the institution, and instituted a comparison between that in Old England, and ours in New England. He showed that while their object was sublime and identical, it was to be executed by means extremely dissimilar; that while they had two stately edifices, and as many select libraries and six able professors, we occupied a part of a seminary building by sufferance, had scarcely commenced collecting a library, and had nothing better in the shape of professors, than the breathing skeleton which stood before them. That while their students had tuition, board, clothing, and other expenses found by the institution, ours had no gratuity but their tuition; and while some of them teach a portion of the year to sustain themselves, on the coarsest fare, in the institution, during the balance of others have saved the night for something to eat through the day. This simple comparison awakened in the young men deep emotions. Signs of new born gratitude were not wanting; the extent of their privileges appeared for the first time to burst upon their view, and their beaming countenances seemed to say we will live answerable to them. The professors then successively expressed themselves with such delicacy of sentiment and pertinency of language, as could only flow from the clearest heads and the kindest hearts. Those listening were electrified, and hear, hear, hear, rang round the table with all the significance of an Englishman's exclamation. Then, having rendered thanks, we retired from the hall with our fraternal bonds evidently invigorated. My subscription list was then requested, and shortly after returned to me, with a number of sovereigns, sufficient to attest the strong interest of the donors in our enterprise.

At our separation, an earnest request was expressed, on the part of the Professors, to open a correspondence with us, so soon as our institute should commence operations. To this we most cordially agreed, not only to enjoy the pleasure of exchanging thoughts with minds so rich, but in the hope of deriving valuable aid from their superior experience.

These unequivocal expressions of lively interest in our persecuted enterprise were intensely grateful to our feelings. This deep sympathy of so important an organ of the great Wesleyan family in Europe was a gushing stream in a sandy desert.

At our departure from these sacred halls, I found myself wrapped in the future, and was conscious of emotions kindred to those awakened by travelling far back into the past. From this sacred retreat, God's messengers were to emanate for many ages to come, through the far off years

of the future. These holy men and their successors were to inscribe the characters of saving truth on thousands of minds, from which they shall be transcribed on millions more. In departing from this place with the benediction of these men, my bosom swelled with emotions which could find utterance only in tears.

Yours, as ever,
JOHN DEMPSTER.

LETTER FROM REV. G. WEBBER.

Liverpool—Its Docks—Nelson's Monument—Traits of Character—Hotel Vesuvius—A Scene at Roan.

Liverpool has in it several objects of interest to the visitor. Among these are its durable and commodious docks and warehouses, for the reception of vessels and merchandise. Of these every one has heard, but it is hardly possible for a person to form any tolerably adequate idea of their vast capacity and permanence of construction, till he has seen them for himself. These docks, and I think also the warehouses, are the property of the city. They are the source of an immense revenue, which has already made the corporation rich, and which is daily adding by thousands to its wealth.

The monument of Lord Nelson, in the court of the Exchange, is another object of interest usually visited by travellers. The device is well conceived and tolerably executed. The image of the hero, as well as all the other figures in the group, is of bronze, and of colossal dimensions. It is placed upon a pedestal of white marble, which is, as nearly as I could judge, ten or twelve feet in height, and six or eight feet square. It stands in a reclining position, or rather as if in the act of falling backward, and is supported by a standard bearer in the rear, who holds in his hand, over the head of his gallant commander, a partially unfurled banner. The right foot of the statue rests upon a piece of cannon, and his left upon a conquered foe, who lies prostrate before him. The goddess of Fame stands on his left, with a crown in her hand, which he is receiving on an outstretched sword held in his left hand, while at the same time the fleshless hand of death, stretched out from beneath a shroud that partially conceals his skeleton form, is laid on the left side of the hero's breast, as if in the act of grasping his heart. Behind, and a little on the left, is a shield, and under this is seen a part of an anchor, with a thick cable partially coiled, upon which the image seems about to fall, as if sinking in death. On the entablature of the pedestal are engraved, in large letters, the words of Nelson on the eve of the above memorable battle: "England expects every man to do his duty!" On the base of the monument are seated eight captives, in chains, which are held in the mouths of lions sculptured in the stone. The whole is protected by an iron railing, by which it is enclosed.

Several of us, Americans, visited this place together, and while standing here, we had an exhibition of the generosity of a certain class of persons, of both sexes, with which England, especially all the cities and large towns of that country, abounds, which, as it exhibits a trait of character so what peculiar to Englishmen, I will here relate. As we were contemplating the objects before us, we stepped a well dressed, respectable looking man, and proposed to give us an historical account of the event intended here to be commemorated, and also a description of the monument. Suspecting the character of his generosity, however, we respectfully declined the proffered service, remarking that we were not entirely ignorant of the history ourselves. He, however, still persisted in his offer, assuring us that no accounts that had been written could give us the information he could communicate, which he would do for a half crown, I think. We, however, gave him to understand that we could dispense with his services. At this he reluctantly walked away, leaving us to gaze on in our ignorance, for all the *unfaded* he would render us. Another instance, illustrative of this trait of character, occurred the same day. Having occasion to call at a certain banking house, and not having its number on the street, I accosted a gentleman of very respectable appearance, who seemed to be standing at leisure, and asked him to be so kind as to direct me to the place. He very readily complied, and walked on before me. A few steps brought us to the door; he opened it, stepped in, and turning round to me, held out his hand, remarking that it was his business to wait on gentlemen about the city, and I might give him what I pleased. I, of course, paid him a fee, for which he politely thanked me, and walked away, to conduct over the city any other stranger he might fall in with.

These are but specimens of what will befal one at almost every turn he takes in any of the cities of this country. You must pay for every service, either real or constructive, even for that which in America is regarded as belonging to the most common courtesies of life. This practice, so offensive and annoying to strangers, and which is no less dishonorable to England, is not confined to the lauders about the streets, but is carried on as a regular system, at all the public hotels, as well as private boarding houses.

Having spent your day or week at one of these establishments, and paid all up, as you would think, and paid heavily, too, you take up your baggage, to be off, when up steps a fellow, and with a mingled look of anxiety and surprise, salutes you with, "You will remember the servant, sir?" Then the maid comes up, "You will remember the chamber-maid, sir?" "You will remember boots, sir?" says a third. "You will object that you 'have had nothing of the servant,' 'you have had no boots dressed?' it is all to no purpose, these bills must be paid, or you will be baffled till you are ashamed, and perhaps the cars will whirl away and leave you behind. These things are all matters of course in England, and must be submitted to, and though exceedingly annoying as well as unjust, yet it is useless to dispute against established custom. In many instances, all the servants receive for their service is obtained in this way, many of them even paying large sums annually to the landlords, for their situation. Travellers expect, of course, to pay all their just bills, but they wish to know what they are to pay, and when they are done paying, and not, after they have paid all that justice can claim, and all the landlord can have a face to put in the bill, to have come down upon them a swarm of hungry leeches, whose name is legion, 'crying give! give!' Whether you are in England or elsewhere in Europe, wherever you fall in with English inholders or English servants, you may expect, as a general thing, about the same treatment. As an illustration of this remark, I will relate an instance that occurred on my way from Paris to Dieppe. On our arrival at Rouen, the moment I alighted from the diligence, in which I had come from the railroad station, I was accosted in English by a smart looking fellow, with the inquiry, 'Will you have some refreshment, sir?' or will you take a view

of the city?" I replied, that I intended to spend the time I might stop in looking about the city. He at once put himself in the attitude of a conductor, and unasked and undesired hastened on before me. We went first to view the Palace of Justice, and then to the ancient Cathedral, and passed hastily through its aisles, and after a very brief stay, having been absent less than thirty minutes, we returned to our hotel. I offered him a franc. He started back with surprise, "Never take less than two francs," was the reply. The diligence was ready, and I must pay or be baffled perhaps for half an hour. I paid him, but was strongly reminded of the advice of an American traveller, whom I met in London, when on my way to France:—"If you would save expense," said he to me, "I would advise you to avoid the English;" advice by no means to be disregarded by the traveller.

It is but just, however, to remark, that many in England are dissatisfied with the practice here complained of, but it has been the custom for ages, and cannot be at once removed. Time will, no doubt, bring it into disrepute.

Dec. 17. GEO. WEBBER.

In the 4th paragraph of my last, 4th line, instead of "now being held," &c., read "none being held," &c.

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

Meeting in New York—Dr. Schumaker's Speech—Mr. Kirk's—Dr. Cox's.

Mr. Editor,—As the subject of the Evangelical Alliance is exciting no little interest among Christians of various denominations, I send you an account of the proceedings at the M. E. Church, Greene street, on Monday evening last. The committee appointed at the convention in London to adopt measures for the organization of the American branch of the Alliance, have been in session for some days past in this city, and called the meeting alluded to, for the purpose of giving information as to the objects and proceedings of the convention, preparatory to forming the branch in this country.

The attendance, both of the clergy and laity, was very large; and long previous to the hour appointed, the church was completely filled, aisles as well as pews.

Dr. Peck, as chairman of the committee, took charge of the meeting, and introduced the speakers. Prayer was offered by Dr. De Witt, of the Dutch Reformed Church, after which an anthem was sung by the choir, commencing, "The earth is the Lord's," &c. Dr. Skinner, of the Presbyterian church, read a portion of Scripture from John 17.

Dr. Schumaker, of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa., was then introduced to the meeting, and made an excellent address in explanation of the object of the meeting, and what he conceived to have been attained by the great London Convention.

"Calvin remarked, that he would gladly cross the ocean seven times, if by so doing he could effect the union of the Protestant churches; so ardent were his aspirations for unity. What was denied to him, has been granted to us. We have crossed the ocean but once, and although many of us have encountered the greatest dangers, and although many vessels and lives have been lost, yet not one of the eighty American delegates has met with any serious misfortune. But if God had seen fit to bury in the deep every delegate from this country, the cause in which we embarked would have not perished with us, but gone on to final triumph."

After explaining the object of the present meeting, as preparatory to a more general meeting of American Christians, the speaker inquired whether the proceedings at the London Convention had been of such a nature as to justify the expenditure of time and money, and the exposure to danger, which had been incurred. He had no doubt, that even if that Alliance formed there should give rise to no response in other countries, its beneficial effects would be felt for years to come. The convention itself was a recognition of the fact, that Christians had one Master, even Christ, no matter what were their denominational peculiarities. From different countries, 1200 minds, differing in opinion on many subjects, had met and exchanged views and opinions, and had separated in harmony and love, interchanging vows of fidelity to the great cause of Christian unity, and pledging themselves to greater watchfulness and forbearance. They ascertained that the points on which all could agree, were more numerous than those on which they disagreed; that diversities of organization did not necessarily prevent unity of spirit; that different religious organizations were unavoidable, so long as honest differences of opinion existed; that the Bible was to be the grand means of promoting union, and that Christian unity was not founded on theoretical principles, but on the doctrine that Christians, united in fundamental views, should unite in common duties, and common privileges.

The speaker, in behalf of the committee, stated that they were not as yet authorized to determine on what should be the future specific action of the American Alliance. This they had deemed it expedient and courteous to defer, until a larger number of the more enlightened minds of the country had had time to confer and strike out the path. They would suggest that one object should be, to bring together Christians of various denominations, and engage in the discussion of the precepts and doctrines laid down in London—to disseminate these views more widely—to hold union prayer meetings—to advise pastors and congregations of other methods of concert and co-operation—to create and extend a pure, enlightened, and catholic literature, and endeavor to exert upon the press, generally, an influence of the same character—and to devise means for the relief of persecuted Christians throughout the world.

At the conclusion of the address, prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. E. Mason, of this city, after which Rev. E. N. Kirk, of Boston, was introduced, and proceeded to answer, at length, most of the objections which have been made to the London Convention. He spoke of the spirit of love which pervaded that assembly, the great minds there met together, of the amicable manner in which their discussions were conducted, the influence which that movement must have on Popery and infidelity, and the great importance of regarding all differences subordinate to those which concern the elements of salvation.

The world has of late seen but little union among Christians. The church (in its largest acceptance) is made up of little circles, and each is endeavoring to get all it can within its own circumference. It is true, these circles must exist, but they must be subordinate. A great line must be drawn, on one side of which every man must be found.

On the other side stands Popery and infidelity, on the other, Protestant Christianity, with its va-

rious denominations. When one crosses the line of repentance and faith, his conscience should settle the question, as to which of the circles he will enter.

We do not intend to give up our opinions, or doctrinal preferences. I prefer to be a Congregationalist, out and out, and I wish my friend, Dr. Peck, was one also; but he is not, and we are going to the same heaven. I wish to begin on this side of heaven to associate with and love those with whom I expect to spend eternity. I look over this crowded audience, and see no two faces alike, but yet there is a similarity in all.—Each is the index of an immortal soul, which I can love, though there are great differences in temper, character, &c. And why can we not love our fellow Christians? I see no impossibility in doing so.

Look at the young convert. He considers all Christians as brethren, until his love begins to grow cold, or his mind is poisoned by sectarianism, of that narrow kind, which cannot look beyond its own limited circle. Ministers, while pointing out their own views, should be careful to avoid introducing their members to sectarianism. Discussion does not imply ill-feeling; Christians should be gentlemen in discussion, and leave wrangling to dogs. Here we are, standing up in the view of infidels. Let us show that we love one another. When we hear of difficulties in other denominations, we should be sorry; and when of success and increase, let us rejoice. It is piety, not our peculiarities, which is to carry us to heaven. If we meet together as a common brotherhood, our love and piety will be increased; there will be more prayer for each other; more meeting at the same communion; more exchanges of pulpits, and our youth will grow up changed against the spirit of sectarianism.

Dr. Cox, of Brooklyn, next addressed the meeting, giving a brief account of the proceedings in London. As this was mostly historical and narrative, it will be unnecessary to do more than refer your readers to the accounts already published in your columns. In conclusion, the Dr. stated that a meeting of all the delegates would be held after the delegates should have assembled," said he, "we will open our hearts, doors, arms, and admit all who are willing to come in and perfect the organization. The Dr. alluded to the great men who composed the convention of London. There was nobility of soul, as well as of birth. 200 members of the Established Church sat with us. There was the brother of the Premier of England, who, in the chair, remarked that he 'had heard that this Alliance was nothing but a conspiracy to blow up the Church of England.' 'I have been here,' said he, 'and enjoyed love that seems to reflect heaven, and I will not so slander the Church of England, as to admit that love, and prayer, and light, and unity, are about to destroy it. If love will destroy it, let it be done; if these elements are to kill it, let it die.'

"Tholuck was there, the star of Germany, and Monod, the French Professor, the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, and his brother, Leland Noel.—There was Bickerstaff, whose work on prayer you have read; and who that saw him, did not feel that whatever his talents were, his pure piety was greater."

The doctor produced a book of autographs collected in England at the convention, and read the following, written by Sir Culling Smith:—"Not to create unity, but to confess it, is our design in assembling together." He also mentioned Bunting, the eminent Methodist, and others who bore a conspicuous part in the doings of the convention.

The Dr. concluded with the remark, that "probably the American character never stood higher in England than it now does," and a severe censure of those countrymen of ours, who go abroad and vituperate the land of their fathers.

The meeting adjourned to meet in Brooklyn, on Christmas evening. Yours truly,
New York, Dec. 17. LORENZO.

THE MISSIONARY PRAYER MEETING.

They came from village, dale and hill,
The old, the young, and gay,
To bow before his righteous will,
On that blessed Sabbath day.

The man of God, who sacred stands
A messenger of love,
Invoked, with trembling, unpraised hands,
A blessing from above.

He prayed for every heathen race,
And every hostile land,
That He who gives or holds his grace,
Would bless each chosen band.

And then his mind seemed bending o'er
Some dark Isle of the sea,
With Father send thy saving power,
And set thy people free.

But think ye not that he alone
That burden close to bear,
For many hearts, all joined in one,
Breathed forth that mission prayer;

And many a soul, attuned by love,
Awoke each feeling true,
And moved by Him who rules above,
Spoke forth a true Amen.

There was a pause, when music sweet
Pealed on in swelling strains,
Glorious and peace and joy shall meet
Where'er the Saviour reigns;

Again we bowed with reverence
Before our Father's face,
While of his grace a glorious scene
Filled all that sacred place.

Again we prayed, Father, forgive
Our selfishness so cold,
And help us all henceforth to live,
As worshippers of old;

Bless those who raise their banners high
Around some heathen shrine,
And as they go, murmuring cry
The remedy divine.

Then music swells again its strains
Of heavenly light and love,
A recompense for all our pains
To gain the port above.

And when that minister stood up,
And breathed his closing prayer,
So rose the blessing in our cup,
'Twas glorious to be there.

Dec. 10. ZEXO.

THE LONDON CONVENTION.

Mr. Editor,—The reports of the late London Convention have been read with more than ordinary care. It is cause of special thanks to God, and of hope to the world, if the sacred bands of love have been more closely drawn around the great Protestant family, the Catholic church. Probably, the theoretical or doctrinal basis adopted there, will prove generally ac-

ceptable. Yet there will be much disappointment and regret, among many who first favored the movement.

Disappointment, 1. That there should not have been some practical basis adopted. We profess to be a practical, as well as a theoretical people. And who does not know that the whole world is suffering much more for want of good practice, than good theories? 2. That no more was done on that august occasion, to inspire interest and efficiency in carrying forward towards perfection, the great Christian enterprises of the age. It is, indeed, a subject of considerable inquiry and speculation, how such an immense body of Christian doctors, divines and laymen, could come together from the four quarters of the globe, and part to meet again only at the resurrection, without making some one, or all of the following subjects, viz., the Bible, the missionary, the Sabbath school, and the tract cause, with the cause of education, a matter of distinct resolution or "topic," on which to hang, at least, one speech. Will it be said these subjects were foreign to the objects of the convention? Who will believe it? Will it be said, they were too small matters for their great minds to consider? Impossible. Or, that they had no time to take them up? And can it be supposed they would be at so great expense of time, money, etc., to cross seas and continents to go to London, to be in such a hurry to get away, that they could not fulfill their mission? It has been intimated that they feared, if they took up these topics, they would have also to take up some such subjects as piracy, theft, capital punishment, war, etc., and so to avoid being troubled with the latter, they avoided altogether the former. But I do not believe any such thing; 'tis too ridiculous. Nor is it easy, I confess, to guess the true reason why all these should have had the go by.

Regret, that there should have been obviously manifested so much sympathy and anxiety for slaveholders, and so little, if any, for the poor slaves. And also, that their action should go so directly and effectually to give countenance and support to that horrible system. I now refer to their action on the question of allowing slaveholders a seat in the convention. If I have been rightly informed, the matter went something after this manner:—A Rev. Mr. Hinton moved that no slaveholders be allowed a seat in the convention. At this, our American (I am strongly inclined to say pro-slavery) delegation took alarm, arose, and opposed it might and main.—There was great excitement. The peace and objects of the convention were in jeopardy, for our delegates threatened to withdraw from the convention if that thing was pressed. It was pleaded that that would exclude some of the greatest and best men in America, for they were under an invincible necessity to hold slaves against both their interests and choice; that they hated slavery, deplored it, and longed to be free from it, but could not get free. To relieve the matter, it was proposed to amend the motion, as to allow such as were thus forced, against their interest and choice, to have a seat among them, and in this form it passed triumphantly. Would to the Lord, our American delegation might have been satisfied to have let it remain. But no; it was now argued that the American churches, and the American government, stood implicated by such a resolution, and they could never consent to such degradation. It was not right, and they did not come there to single out any particular church, or any particular government of any particular country, to implicate and degrade them in the eyes of all others. Finally, a motion was made to reconsider the vote; it was reconsidered, and the door opened for all, indiscriminately. What man, I asked, true to anti-slavery principles, will not regret, for ever regret, so lamentable a result? But for our American delegation, slavery would have been stamped with burning infamy, by one of the most learned, influential, powerful, and holy bodies of godly men ever together since the apostles, the delegations of other countries being generally ready to do it justice.

Br. Stevens, if the facts as above stated are not substantially so, let them be contradicted. I shall have pleasure in acknowledging that I have been misinformed. We want the facts as they occurred; "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." It has been observed that the Herald, and the Advocate, too, have preserved a marked silence, respecting the facts as they occurred connected with this question. It is not denied that you have justified their action in the premises, and called upon all men of judgment to justify them too. For one, I want the facts as they were—if I have them not already—and then I shall judge. I reverence great names and good men, but I reverence principles more.

I will only add here, since there is to be an attempt to form an American section of the Alliance, it is my deliberate opinion, that more harm than good will come of it, especially if slaveholders, indiscriminately, are to be included. It will create wider and more incensed divisions among different denominations, and divide, subdivide, and break up churches of the same denominations. The attempt must be hazardous in the extreme. The churches in America are not ready for such an Alliance. It is true, our learned and most excellent Dr. Peck, has told us the delegates did not pledge themselves how they should vote when they got home. Ah! And is it reasonable for us to expect—would it be consistent for them to go to London, and vote to receive slaveholders, indiscriminately, and then come home to America, and vote to reject them all? For one, I look for no such thing.

JUSTIN SPAULDING.
Claremont, N. H., Dec. 1.

A WIDOW INDEED.

Passing the door of a steward, some weeks since, I was invited in to receive a donation from an elderly widow. Graciously for her purpose, and more than willing to be the almoner of her liberality, I joyfully entered, expecting to receive some small amount which would benefit the giver more than the cause. But to my surprise, I was presented with two little sack purses, or bags, one containing fifty silver half pence, and the other three five dollar gold pieces, three silver dollars, and twenty-four half dollars, making in all fifty dollars. Twenty-five dollars of this, I was desired to give to the missionary cause, and to distribute the balance among the old itinerant ministers at my discretion, but was emphatically requested not to reveal the donor's name. This was a rather hard case, but I have thus far complied with her request, and even her minister does not know that she has given a dollar.

The secret of this affair is, the old lady had the money and could live without it, and she had prayed to God for direction in its appropriation. The result was as I have stated. If others in like circumstances were to imitate her in prayer, they would probably find less difficulty in disposing of their funds, and the itinerant would not be forgotten.

J. PORTER.

HERALD AND JOURNAL.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1846.

JESSE LEEVIN NEW ENGLAND.

Annals—Reaction of Calvinism—Lee enters New England—Norwalk—Scenes at Fairfield—New Haven—Reading—Stratford.

We enumerated, last week, some of the reasons which justified the introduction of Methodism into New England, such as the general declension of piety, the prevailing doctrine respecting the atonement and evidence of Christian experience. There were further reasons.

Methodism came with the voice of reformation against some of the principal doctrines of the Puritan church, which it deemed derogatory to the gospel, and of dangerous practical consequences. Such were the tenets of Predestination, Pre-repentance, Final Perseverance, Infant Damnation, &c. We shall see hereafter that these were considered fundamental truths at the time of Lee's visit to New England, and that some of his most serious, as well as his most ludicrous, encounters arose from them.

But few forms of religious belief were more repulsive to the people of New England, at the time of our introduction among them, than that which is called Arminianism. It is curious to observe what distorted ideas of its doctrines were then current. The author of the "Great Awakening" says: "There was then a horror of Arminianism such as is difficult now to understand. Men had not then forgotten the tremendous evils which had grown out of the doctrine of salvation by works."

"The argument most constantly used against Arminianism, in those days, was its tendency to prepare the way for Popery." "There had been a gradual and silent increase of Arminianism. Scarcely any would acknowledge themselves Arminians; but, in many places, the preaching more and more favored the belief that the unconverted might, without supernatural aid, commence and carry on a series of works preparatory to conversion; and that those who could do it were doing very well, and were in little danger."

It is evident that the author of the work from which we quote is not exempt, himself, from similar objections to Arminianism. And yet no system of religious opinion can be more hostile than this to the very evils ascribed to it. From no passage of the works of Arminius can the "doctrine of salvation by works" be fairly deduced. It was a "leading proposition" of his system, that the Christian is not to be saved by the legal issue of their system; while no such relation can be asserted between Arminianism and Pelagianism. The capital difference between Calvinists and Arminians relates to the subject of unconditional election, and its necessary consequences—the final perseverance of the elect, and the reprobation of the non-elect. The only ground that Calvinists have for alleging that we teach "salvation by works" is the fact that we deny this tenet. But how does this deny involve the rejection of the doctrine of justification by faith, &c., so pertinaciously attributed to Arminianism?

Methodism attempted the correction of these misapprehensions, and the attempt has not been successful. Prejudice has yielded to better information. The Calvinists of New England have seen that men can believe themselves sinners, and acknowledge the full merit of the atonement, without receiving the "horrible decretum," as it was properly named by Calvin himself. It is a fact which cannot be denied, that the Geneva theology is, to say the least, latent in New England. Some still adhere to its doctrines, but they seldom receive a distinct enunciation in the public assembly. There is a universal conviction that the popular mind will not tolerate them; and this, too, be it remarked, not at a time of spiritual declension, but of advanced religious interest. Methodism has had an agency in this change, without doubt. She has scattered through New England thousands of laymen, and hundreds of preachers, who glory in the doctrine of universal atonement. Their numbers and unvaried activity have had effect. Thousands and tens of thousands have received, with gladness and praise, their enlarged views of the divine compassion of the Father, and the atoning merit of the Son; and these views begin to find utterance in all the pulpits of the land.

Further: the entrance of Methodism into New England we have already considered eminently providential, in another regard. The rigid theology of her old churches was rapidly producing that disastrous reaction which has attended it in every other land. Universalism, Unitarianism, and semi-infidelity, had been germinating under its shade. They have grown and borne fruit since, but not to the extent they would, had not a more benignant creed been presented to the community. One of the most rigid organs of Unitarianism admits that, "The Unitarian apostasy has involved a large proportion of the churches which were first organized by the first settlers of New England. In the Plymouth colony, the original churches were first in the apostasy; and the church in St. Markfield is now the oldest Orthodox church in that colony. And, in the Massachusetts colony, the six first, out of the time of organization, have gone; and the church in Lynn is now the oldest Orthodox church of the Massachusetts colony. All that were established before it have despised their birthright, and are in hostility to the doctrine and religion of the Puritans, and of the Reformation."

It is well known that all the Puritan churches of Boston became infected with Socinianism, until only one (the Old South) still maintained a dubious acknowledgment of the Geneva faith. It was the horror which the dependent doctrines of Calvin inspired, that led to the remarkable change; and we have reason to believe that Methodism has afforded an intermediate and safe ground for thousands who, in their revolt from Calvinism, would otherwise have passed over to the other and more fatal extreme.

Such were the circumstances which justified and demanded the introduction of Methodism into New England. That it did not mistake its mission, has been demonstrated by the result. Besides its own prosperous growth, the churches of New England are again alive, and their moral energies active for the salvation of the world. What agency has done it, under the divine Spirit? Has the existence of some six hundred preachers, traversing the land and ceaselessly laboring, and some seventy thousand churches, been the sole cause of this, seen without effect on the public mind? Has it had no part—no highly important part—in the resurrection of religion? Could such an agency operate any where, even in a heathen community, without important effect? What other special agency has operated meanwhile? We wish not presumptuously to exalt Methodism. We wish only its actual influence, its historical position among the churches, acknowledged. Were there a more candid disposition to acknowledge it, we should be saved the tedious task of asserting it. The fact is unquestionable, that Methodism, with its circuits and districts intersecting the whole land, its numerous annual camp-meetings, its perpetual revivals, its innumerable class-meetings, prayer meetings, four days meetings, its diplomatic mode of preaching, and its assiduous pastoral labors, has aroused New England, infusing or provoking its churches by its example. The assumption cannot be gainsaid. Not only is it matter of history, but of sober and irrefragable inference, that such universal and powerful agencies have had effect, extraordinary effect. Within view of almost every Congregational church in New England, the successors of Lee have erected a tabernacle whose altar has been laboriously belabored with the tears of the penitent and the renewed. While we have thus set an example to our predecessors, and provoked their zeal, it is a well known fact that a large proportion of our converts have gathered into their churches, carrying with them, we trust, some of the spirit of our cause.

But though thus justified by both the reasons and the results of its introduction into New England, the progress of Methodism has, from the beginning, cost untold exertions on the part of its mission and people. We shall trace more directly these exertions.

The first two or three years of the history of Methodism in New England is but the personal biography of its remarkable founder. During the first year, he was alone in the new field, and when others came to his help, he left them to occupy the points he had already established, while he himself went to and fro in all directions, penetrating to the remotest north-eastern frontier, preaching in private houses, in barns, on the highways, forming new circuits, and identifying himself with every advancement of the church.

We have seen him depart from the Conference at New York, for Connecticut. He arrived the 11th of June, and preached his first sermon in New England at Norwalk, the 17th of June. The difficulties he encountered in the outset were characteristic of the community, and were met with his characteristic perseverance.

"Wednesday, June 17, I set off," he says, "to take a tour further in Connecticut than ever any of our preachers have been. I am the first that has been appointed to this State, by the Conference. I set off with prayer to God for a blessing on my endeavors, and with an expectation of many oppositions. At 4 o'clock I arrived in Norwalk, and went to a Mr. Rogers' where one of our friends had asked the liberty for me to preach. When I came, Mrs. R. told me her husband was from home, and was not willing for me to preach in his house. I told her we would hold meetings in the road, rather than give any man an excuse. We proposed speaking in an old house, which stood just by, but she was not willing. I then spoke to an old lady about preaching in her orchard, but she would not consent, and said we would tread the grass down. The other friend went and gave notice to some of the people. They soon began to collect, and we went to the road, where we had an apple tree to shade us. When the woman saw that I was determined to preach, she said I might preach in the old house; but I told her I thought it would be better to remain where we were. So I began on the side of the road, with about twenty hearers. After singing and praying, I preached on John 3:7. 'Ye must be born again.' I left saying that we were favored with a comfortable place. After preaching, I told the people that I intended to be with them again in two weeks, and if any of them would open their houses to receive me, I should be glad; but if they were not willing, we would meet at the same place. Some of them came, and desired that I should meet at the town-house, the next time; so I gave consent. Who knows but I shall yet have a place in this town where I may by his lead?"

Thursday, 18th, I rode about sixteen miles, to Fairfield, and put up at Mr. Penfield's tavern, near the court-house, soon told them who I was, and what was my errand. The woman of the house asked me a few questions, and in a little time wished to know if I had a liberal education. I told her I had just education enough to carry me through the country. I got a man to go with me to see two of the principal men of the town, in order to get permission to preach in the court-house. The first said he had no objection; the other said he was very willing. However, he asked me if I had a liberal education. I told him I had nothing to boast of, though I had education enough to carry me through the country. Then I went to Mr. Penfield's, and desired the schoolmaster to send word by his scholars, that I was to preach at 6 o'clock. He said he would, but he did not think many would come. I waited till after the time, and no one came; at last I went and opened the door, and sat down."

Chilling prospects, certainly, for a flaming mind like his, burning with the magnificent idea of founding in these Eastern States a new religious organization, which, in less than half a century, was to dot their surface with its chapels, and scatter over their hills and valleys its six hundred ministerial heralds! Most men, placed in Lee's circumstances at this time, as he sat solitary in the village school-house, would have persevered in his project an eternity, no less halting than so the grandeur of the design. Not so this man of God. Even here a ray of hope, at least, dawned on him. "At length," he says, "the school-master and three or four women came. I began to sing, and in a little time thirty or forty collected. Then I preached on Rom. 6:23: 'For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.' I felt a good deal of satisfaction in speaking. My soul was happy in the Lord, and I could not but bless God that he gave me to feel for the souls of those that heard me. The people were very solemn toward the end of the sermon, and many of them afterwards expressed, in my hearing, their great satisfaction in hearing the discourse. After Mrs. Penfield came back to the tavern, she pressed me much to call the next day and preach at her sister's, who, she said, was much engaged in religion, and would be much pleased with my manner of preaching. This appeared to be an opening of the Lord; so I told her I would. I stayed all night, and prayed with the family, who were very kind, and would not charge me anything, but asked me to call again."

The prospect brightened the next day. God had prepared for him a little band of congenial spirits, who had been praying and waiting for the arrival of such a message of salvation as he now bore to the East. Referring to the request of the lady just mentioned, he says:

"Friday, 19th, I rode to Timothy Wheeler's, about four miles, and after delivering a letter to the woman of the house from her sister, Mrs. Penfield, she read it, and seemed much rejoiced that I had come. She then began to tell me how it had been with her, and said there were a few of them that met once a week to sing and pray together; but they were much discouraged by their elder friends, and that they had been wishing and praying for some one to come and instruct them, and seemed to believe that God had sent me. At length she said she was so rejoiced that her strength had almost left her, and sitting down, she began to weep. Mr. Black, one of our preachers, had been there a few years before, and some of the people had been wishing for the Methodists ever since. They spread the news as much as they could, and at 7 o'clock the people met, and I preached to an attentive congregation. After meeting, some of the people stayed to talk to me about religion, and wished to be instructed in the ways of the Lord. I think five or six of them are truly awakened; one, I think, has experienced a change of heart; but those under discipline would be often saying they were afraid they had never been awakened. I told them, if they saw that they were in danger of hell, and felt a desire to be born again, they might know that they were truly awakened."

On Sunday, 21st, we find him at New Haven, the Athens of the State. It was a stormy day, but he preached in the court-house, at 5 o'clock, to a considerable congregation, on Amos 5:6: 'Seek ye the Lord, and ye shall live.' Among his auditors were the President of the College, many of the students, and a Congregational clergyman of the place. "I spoke," he says, "as if I had no doubt but God would reach the hearts of the hearers by the discourse. The people paid great attention to what I said, and several expressed their satisfaction. Mr. Jones asked me to go to tea with him, which invitation I accepted. While together, I told him much of our plan."

"Wednesday, 24th, I travelled a stony road to Reading, and according to direction, called on Esq. Benedict, but he was not at home; so I got my horse and rode to Mr. Rogers', to consult him about the matter. While I was talking to him, informed him who I was, asked me some questions about my doctrines, and I endeavored to inform him what kind of doctrines we preached. He said he could not invite me into the meeting-house, because I held what he thought was contrary to the gospel. I told him I did not expect an invitation to preach in the meeting-house, but if I was asked, I should not refuse. However, Mr. Rogers sent his son down in a little time to let me know that there was a school-house at which I might preach in, so I made the appointment for the people at 6 o'clock. Having met at that hour, I preached on Isa. 55:6: 'Seek ye the Lord while he may be found.' &c. I bless God that I had some liberty in preaching. The old minister at whose house I lodged, is a great advocate for dancing, although he does not practice it himself."

It was at Reading that the second class formed in New England was organized before the end of the present year. From thence he rode to Danbury, and obtained permission to preach in the court-house, twice on the same day. From Danbury he went to Ridgefield, where he was permitted to preach in the town house. He also visited Rockwell, in Wilton Parish, Canaan, Millislee, Norwalk, Fairfield, and had some hope that the Lord would the word preached at each of these places.

On Friday, 31 July, he reached Stratford, and found another little company of devout and congenial minds, who sympathized cheerfully with him in his solitary course. He says:—"I preached at Stratford, at the house of Deacon Hawley. The house was filled with hearers. I had great satisfaction in preaching, and some of the people were melted into tears. I felt my soul transported with joy; and it appeared to me that God was about to do great things for the neighborhood. There are about a dozen in the place that meet every week for the purpose of conversing on the subject of religion, and of spending some time in prayer; some of them belong to the Church of England, and others are Congregationalists. They desired me to meet with them in the evening, to which I consented. I spoke to them just as I would at one of our class meetings, and it was a very comfortable time. The greater part of them knelt down when we went to prayer; a great number of them never did before in public. They all seemed exceedingly pleased with the manner of the meeting; several thanked me for my advice, and desired me to remember them in my prayers. The deacon's wife told me that some of them had an intention of joining us. I told her, if they desired it I could not object, though I did not intend to persuade them. I hope the Lord will direct, bless, and save them."

The next day he was on his way to Stratford, the principal village of the town, in which was formed, in less than a year from the present date, the first Methodist Society of the State. Yet we find him approaching it with extreme misgivings:—"Saturday, 4th, I set off about the middle of the day, and was much exercised about calling to preach at Stratford. Sometimes I seemed to have no faith; but at other times

had a little hope that good might be done. At last I determined to take up my cross and make the trial. So I went, put up at a tavern, and called on the man that kept the key of the town house, obtained his consent to preach in the house. But he said he did not know much about the Methodists; they might be like the New Lights. I told him I did not know much about the latter, but some people said we favored them in our preaching. 'Well, (says he,) if you are like them, I would not wish to have anything to do with you.'"

"He (Mr. R.) deprecated the attempt to introduce the subject. The Alliance did not assume to be a church, nor did it pronounce definitively on human character. We ought temperately and meekly to regard the situation of our brethren. Slavery, indeed, was a foul blot on the escutcheon of the United States, especially when set in contrast with their famed declaration of human rights. Yet circumstances were often occurring, which should command our grave consideration and sympathy. One was mentioned by Dr. Skinner. A colored free woman was married to a slave: he was about to be sold, and therefore in danger of being separated from her; his wife had accumulated some property, and bought him—bought her husband—and now holds him as her property. Is that woman to be blotted from membership in the Church of Christ?"

"Ever since the meeting of the Alliance, the Anti-Slavery League has manifested the greatest opposition, and has thus virtually resolved itself into an 'Anti-Engelical Alliance.' Referring especially to the efforts of Mr. W. L. Garrison, Mr. R. expressed his fear, that under pretence of anti-slavery zeal, Mr. G. had taken opportunity to spread infidel principles."

"The tenacity of the Congregationalists in their great liberty toward the last, and some of the people dropped several silent tears, and the countenances of many showed that the word reached their hearts. I had two of the Congregational ministers to hear me; Mr. Austin, the minister of the house, and Dr. Edwards, son of the former President of Princeton College. After meeting, I came out, and some told me they were much pleased with the discourse; but no man asked me home with him. I went back to the tavern, and retired into a room and went to prayer, and felt the need of a new strength. I did believe the Lord had sent me there. If so, I would not be discouraged by the opposition."

In a little time Mr. David Beecher came and asked me to go home with him, and said he would be willing to entertain me when I came to town again. I went home with him, and his wife was very kind; but his wife is not a friend of Calvinism. After dark, a young woman got her work and set down to knitting; I was, indeed, much astonished at it, it being Sunday evening, and spoke to her about it. They told me it was customary for the Congregationalists throughout the State, to commence the Sabbath on Saturday evening, and continue it until sunset on Sunday."

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I would be willing to take a text and preach my principles fully, for the people wanted to know them. I told him I was not willing to do it at that time, and intimated to him that if I preached I would wish to preach on a subject that I thought would be most for the glory of God, and the good of the hearers; and told him that I did not believe a sermon on principles would be for the glory of God, at that time. He then wanted to talk about Christian perfection, and said there was no perfection in this life. I then made mention of a few texts of Scripture, which put him to a stand. The room was by that time quite full of people, and he asked me again, before them all, if I would preach upon my principles? I looked upon it, that he asked me before so many, that he might have it to say that I refused to let my principles be known, because they were too bad to be heard; so I told him, if I found freedom, I would on a future day appoint a time for the purpose, and preach fully on the subject. He observed that some of the people would come to hear me out of curiosity. Here some was offended because I preached the possibility of being suddenly changed from a state of sin to a state of grace."

He had thus fairly entered the field. In our next we shall trace his further progress in it.

On Wednesday, the 8th, he was once more in Reading, and met again Rev. Mr. Bartlett, the pugnacious Congregationalist, who, with the spirit then, and still to some extent so characteristic of New England, insisted upon various questions of doctrine. "The minister," he writes, "and a few other people, came in, and wanted to enter into a conversation about principles, and inquired what kind of doctrines we held; but I said little to them. At length the people requested the minister to give me leave to preach in the meeting-house; but he said he was not willing, and should not give his consent; but if the people chose it, he should not stop it. Then he asked me if I

For the Herald and Journal.

"THE CHRISTIAN HOMEWARD BOUND."

By Dr. Stevens.—If you think the following lines may be usefully employed in devotion, you will please give them an insertion in the Herald. The poetry is by Miss De Forest, with the alteration of a few words, and such alterations in the arrangement as seemed necessary to adapt it to social meetings.

Tune, "Jesus, lover of my soul." 72, or, "Watchman, tell us of the night."

Homeward bound! Homeward bound!
O'er a long and hostile ground,
With a weary step and slow,
Onward still I go, I go,
Nostalgic heart, and midnight chill,
Storm and tempest work their will;
Yet one precious view of home
Cheers me on where'er I roam.

Homeward bound! A far, a far,
Gleams my precious, guiding star,
Giving forth no borrowed light,
Yet for ever pure and bright,
Night may throw her sable shroud,
Wintry winds may whistle loud,
But the star of Bethlehem
Storm and tempest cannot dim.

Homeward bound! They call me on,
Lords of ones who to heaven have gone;
Ones on earthy ground they toiled,
Yet their garments kept unsold;
Once they meekly bore the cross,
Counted all things else but loss;
Now as witnesses they stand,
Beck'ning to the shining land.

Homeward bound! Homeward bound!
Light from heaven beams all around,
Brighter still that light shall be,
Till the blessed death I see.
Now the Spirit doth reveal
To the hearts he came to seal
Things that words never knew,
Gloriously sweet and true.

Homeward bound, my motto be,
Weal and woe alike to me;
Knowing well I cannot fall
While I trust in Christ my all;
He will lighten every cross,
He will lessen every loss,
And as last my soul receive,
Ever in his smile to live.

Brunswick, Dec. 13.

D. FULLER.

SLAVERY.

For the Herald and Journal.

REPLY TO DR. BANGS ON SLAVERY.

NO. IV.

DUTY OF MASTERS, AS GIVEN BY ST. PAUL, WOULD OF ITSELF ABOLISH SLAVERY.

My plan of emancipation is, first of all to convince the slaveholder and all concerned that slavery is not allowed in the word of God—that it is essentially a sinful relation—one which Heaven never meant, made, or allows. This doctrine, as the true basis on which to construct a plan of emancipation, lies to be not only Scriptural and philosophical, but the best adapted to the Southern mind. The South has never received very favorably those exceptions, circumstances, and hair-splitting which have been so often put forth on this subject at the North. They appear rather to argue that, as in mathematics every line is a curve or a straight one, so in morals that every action must be either a right or a wrong one. Let the above great truth only once obtain a lodgment in the South, and we will soon see something very effectual done. And I do not despair of such a lodgment. There are yet in that country consciences to be reached and susceptibilities to be affected. We must have more faith—faith in the power of truth, and faith in our fellow-men who are under the influence of divine grace.

The rampart of defence which slavery has thrown around the South, from Maryland to Mexico, is giving way; it has been already perforated in many places, through which the rays of heavenly light on this subject are streaming all over the country, from the palace of the planter to the cottage of the backwoodsman, who has been so long crushed by this system. Napoleon conquered the armies of Europe by concentration, by directing all his force on one point, until he had effectually carried it, broken the enemy's line, and then afterwards he cut them up in detail. In effecting the peaceable emancipation of slavery, I am sensible that the conscience must first be carried—excited to action by the light of God's truth on this very subject—and then the smaller matters of policy and interest may be brought as auxiliaries in this warfare.

Viewing the plan of emancipation in this light, I shall attempt to reach the conscience by showing that slavery has no support from the New Testament Scriptures. Many have doubted concerning the sinfulness of slavery, because it has not been condemned expressly by name in the Bible. All such persons should remember that in those writings there are two ways in which evils are condemned: the one in the aggregate, by a specific name, and the other in detail, by condemning the several parts of which it is composed. In this latter way slavery, duelling, gambling, and many other sins are condemned, although they have not been specifically named.

Slavery is a compound, made up of many simple, such as injustice, the withholding of wages for work rendered, oppression, the keeping one down from the enjoyment of his natural rights, cruelty, the infliction of such pains and penalties as will compel one to submit to the control of another, and several other ingredients, every one of which is condemned throughout the entire word of God. Now, if the several parts are bad, the whole which is made up of these parts must certainly be bad also. Inspiration is not defective. God knew from the beginning what was necessary to communicate, and has already revealed his wrath from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, of every kind and description. So that if some new species of devilry should be gotten up, unnamed in the Bible or in our language, we could find enough already revealed to condemn and not suffer it to pass unrebuked until we found a name for it and a specific communication concerning it. If a physician were to say that the patient was diseased in every limb and organ, that the head was deranged and the whole heart faint, that folly it would be for one to imagine that he was still in health, because the physician had not said in express terms that the patient was sick. So the word of God, in the most positive and effectual manner, condemns slavery, by condemning every essential element of which it is composed. This, indeed, is the strongest way in which it could be condemned.

In a subject like this, where the proofs are so very abundant, there is a great difficulty in making a selection. In the present short essay, I shall confine myself to one point: To show that the duties which are enjoined on masters in the New Testament are such that, if they were only obliged or enforced, they would immediately drive slavery out of every church in Christendom. These duties are mainly set forth in the epistles, and are, "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." Col. 4:1.—"And ye masters, do the same thing unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master

also is in heaven, neither is there respect of persons with him." Eph. 6:9.

These commandments, however, are as applicable to masters who have hired servants, apprentices, or any one in their employment, as they are to masters of slaves, and will be of practical use when slavery shall have been driven from the earth. But at present we will consider them addressed to the masters of slaves. And let us now ascertain their meaning. "Masters, give to your servants that which is just and equal," or, as some render the words, *right and equal*. The first word is a legal term, and must refer to some law, rule, or usage. When we say a thing is just, we immediately compare it in our minds with some legal standard. Now, what was this legal standard to which masters were to conform?

1. It was not any slave code, specifically revealed from heaven for the government of slaves as a distinct class from freemen, because no such specific code can be found in the Bible. The commandments of the New Testament, on the contrary, are given to the whole race of man, without granting exclusive privileges to any one class over another, and are all founded on the principles of substantial equity to every individual.

2. It was not the law or usage of Greek and Roman masters, in regard to their slaves; for by it they were allowed to torture their slaves, starve them, beat them to death, and throw them in their fish ponds to fatten the millets. According to Roman law, the slave was *nullius in bonis*—a chattel—had no rights, and was incapable of injury. Now, it would be an insult to the God of justice and purity, to suppose that he held up this system of slavery as the standard by which the Christian was to administer justice and equity to his brother in the Lord.

3. Nor was it that unwritten, undefined, but generally received standard which obtains among the better class of slaveholders, and those who believe "that slavery under certain circumstances is justifiable," and which consists in giving the slave "Proper food, proper raiment, due rest, and no more than moderate work." Now all this, when observed to its full extent, is not doing justice to the slave—or rather to the man—it is not keeping the commandment which requires that the master shall give to the servant that which is just. All that this standard amounts to, is only keeping the slave in a laboring condition, but it is not giving any thing whatever for the labor rendered; it is only sustaining him for the day to the slaveholder more of his labor hereafter; but it is not paying the man any more than it is the horse, the ox, or the steam engine that is supplied with oil to keep it from wearing out. In all this there is no remuneration. But in the commandment, remuneration is the very thing required; "That which is just and equal."

"To him who useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." There must be remuneration, *quid pro quo*, something for something. Nothing short of this will fulfill the command, satisfy the demands of justice, or escape the righteous judgment of God. Nor does it relieve the matter if the slave consent to any thing less; for he is in a state of duress, and consequently incapable of making a bargain. The fact is, the ability to labor is the property which God gave the man, and whoever takes it out of him, takes that which is his, and does not belong to him; and if he takes it by force, it is robbery, and if without the owner's knowledge, or through his ignorance, it is theft.

4. As the commandment given by the apostles to masters cannot refer to any of the above standards, we believe the injunction, "Give unto your servants that which is just," has a reference in this case, as in all other, to the common statute law of heaven, which requires all men, without distinction, "To keep judgment and do justice, for God is no respecter of persons." Now on what authority dare we say that this standing law of God does not apply to those whom some call slaves? Who is a slave? A human being, created in the image of God, who has been kidnapped, or who has been born of kidnapped parents. Now, shall this first outrage be plead in justification of all succeeding ones, of outlavery both in church and state, and the putting a human being beyond the pale of common humanity? Yet it is the only real plea in justification of all slavery; presenting the commission of one wrong as a sufficient reason for the commission of many more. Whenever any human authority denominates a man a slave, does this change our relation to him in any way, or absolve us from our former duty to him? Not in the least. God does not change his law at the caprice of human States; the relations which he has fixed from the beginning remain the same; this man, denominated a slave, stands in the same relation to his fellow men that he did before, and God will hold all men answerable to render him the same duties which they were to render before he was called a slave. As Professor Wayland justly says, the relations of God are fixed—"The relation in which men stand to each other, is essentially the relation of equality; not equality of condition, but equality of right." And it is an impious temerity in any man, or community of men, to attempt to change this relation, or to keep it changed, in opposition to the order of God. What though some little community in Algiers, South Carolina, or any other slave holding country, should decree that a certain man, or class of men, were slaves; would their ipse dixit at once change the eternal relations which God has established from the beginning, and pull down an heir of immortality to the level of merchandise; so that after this, it would be doing him justice to give him, like the horse, enough to eat, to drink, and to wear? No indeed; as Robert Burns says, "a man 'a man for a' that," and our duty still remain the same to him for a' that and a' that.

Hence it follows that every slaveholder in our country, whether he be Methodist, Presbyterian, or infidel, who does not pay to those whom he calls slaves, a full, fair equivalent for every day's work upon his plantation, does not do them justice, and is living every day in the violation of the injunction under examination. Your correspondent says, "He knows some slaveholders who treat their slaves with justice;" my opportunities of acquaintance have been considerable, and I have known thousands at the South, yet I never knew one that treated his slaves with justice; for the idea of giving to the slaves with justice; for the compensation for his labor never once enters into the mind of the slaveholder. In saying this, I do not pronounce on their guilt or innocence, this is too high for me—that depends on their knowledge or their means of knowing; but that they act unjustly, in coercing work for which they pay no wages, is as clear to me as a sunbeam.

There is one inference more which must be drawn from the above exposition. And that is, as all masters are to give their servants that which is just and equal, none of them are so placed by the providence of God that they cannot comply with this requirement. We have had a great deal said and written about slave laws, and the utter impossibility that the master should disconnect him from slavery; but this whole subject has been strangely mystified. Whatever God has commanded to be done, can be done. He requires no impossibilities, and what has been already done, can be done again. What can prevent any slaveholder in the worst slaveholding States of our Union, from giving fair adequate wages for the labor done on his plantation? He is the master of his own domain; and if he were to pay those who did his work, allow them to manage for themselves, or if he were to give

them a pass to remove to a free State, where is the law, or who is the individual, who could call him to account for all this? Or, if any of those to whom he had given domestic freedom, wished to work for him and continue on the plantation with the relatives, how easily he could exercise his legal relation to them for their protection and benefit, in defending them against the iniquitous State laws. Many mystify and confound civil freedom with domestic. The State may say that he shall not dissolve in law the relation of master and slave; but this does not prevent him from dissolving it domestically and really by granting the above cited privileges. Suppose, for instance, that a Mahomedan in Turkey, having four wives, should embrace Christianity, in this case he could not dissolve his legal relation to them, but would be bound to sustain it and support them; but would this legal relation compel him still to live with the four in the relation of husband among wives? As soon as he had dissolved his relation of husband with three of them, he was morally and really in that relation clear of them, and was no longer a polygamist; although the law might still hold him in that relation.

When the venerable Garrison, of precious memory, emancipated his slaves, he had none of these difficulties about civil law. His words are, "The conviction was, that it was wrong to hold my fellow beings in bondage—I paused a moment, and then replied: 'Lord, the oppressed shall go free; and I was as clear of them in my mind as if I never owned one. I told them they did not belong to me, that I did not desire their services without making them a compensation.'"

So then, in analyzing the first requisition in the master's duty, as set forth in the New Testament, we find that the compliance to the most obvious and simple principles of justice would entirely subvert the whole system.

D. DE VINCE.
New Castle, N. Y., Nov. 12, 1846.

For the Herald and Journal.

SINLESS SLAVERY.

The doctrine that slavery is sin under all circumstances—*sin per se*—has been, and is, stoutly opposed by many who call themselves anti-slavery men. The advocates of the doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of slavery, are denounced as ultra. Among this class I have been reckoned, and have been charged with making a wrong application of the term slavery—an application leading to deception, because not in accordance with the popular and legal use of the term. But to this charge I plead not guilty, and shall put myself on my defence. The question involved in the controversy, is little else than a matter of definition, and is reduced to this: What is the popular and legal import of the term slavery? In my own language, I should say, it is holding a human being in absolute bondage, from motives of self-interest. But let us see whether this is the popular and legal definition. I know of no better authority to which we can refer for a popular definition of any word, than Dr. Webster's Dictionary. And what does Dr. Webster say? "Bondage; the state of entire subjection of one person to the will of another. It is true, that this definition does not expressly include the motives for holding; but I ask, are they not implied? Is the subjection entire where the motives are not selfish? Or is the subjection entire, where the motives are benevolent, and where the only bond is the legal relation? Now, if Dr. Webster's definition is the popular definition, and if the cases where the holding is not from selfish, but from benevolent motives, and the only bond is the force of law, are not cases of entire subjection, then it follows, most lucidly, that my definition is the popular definition, and for the reason that it is substantially the definition of Dr. Webster.

But there is a difficulty in the position assumed by my opponents. They say, that when the holding is from benevolent motives, and the only bond the force of law, it is as verily slavery, as it is where the motives are of an opposite character. Here is one case where the motives are positively good, and yet another where the motives are positively bad; not only cases which are different in their nature, but directly opposite; and yet they are both slavery. So that what constitutes slavery, has no moral qualities; the moral qualities belong to the circumstances which attend it. If this be so, what becomes of the doctrine that slavery is only wrong in the abstract? My opponents have abandoned the old track, and have conjured up a new one. Once, slavery was sin in the abstract, now it is not sin at all. The sin is all in the circumstances attending it. Take these away, and you take all the sin away. But I say, that which makes slavery, makes the sin; and that which makes the sin, makes the slavery. It is the subjecting of a human being to the absolute will of another human being, that constitutes slavery; and it is in this self-same properties the sin is found. If the subjection be not absolute, and the motives and purposes be benevolent, there is, then, the entire absence of every element which enters into the constitution of slavery. There are many forms of slavery, for which my opponents contend, as a mere legal guardianship. A benevolent man avails himself of the slave code of the State where he lives, to protect defenceless humanity from the cruelty and injustice of that same code. Nor is this a solitary case of the kind. The law of Massachusetts, which was designed to license the sale of intoxicating drinks, is wrong in itself, but it has been used by the benevolent for very merciful and good purposes. Many a family, exposed to the malevolence of a fiend, has been protected by its enforcement; so many a person at the South, has been protected from the legitimate operation of slave laws, by the use of good men have made of those laws. But my opponents insist that the slavery is in the relation. In what relation? Why, in the relation of master and slave. I admit that there is slavery in such a relation, but I deny that there is master and slave in the cases they suppose. But does not the law call them master and slave? Very true; but it utters a falsehood; it calls things by wrong names. It was never the design, in the enactment of a slave code, that its provisions should be used for the purpose of protecting men, doomed to slavery, from the essential cruelties of the system, and, therefore, when used for such purposes, it creates a relation very different from what was intended. The intention was to empower one man to hold another in absolute bondage, from motives of self-interest. But when the power is used for a purpose exactly the reverse of that, the relation designed to be created, is not created. The relation designed to be created, was that of master and slave; the relation actually created, is that of protector and protected. If such a relation be slavery, I would to Heaven that slavery was universal. But suppose such a relation, or the disposition it implies, did universally prevail among men, would any body call it slavery? I trow not. Why, then, call it slavery, because it exists in a limited degree, and in the midst of human bondage? Existing under such circumstances, it is the more necessary that it should be designated by a name that would show it in bold contrast with, and opposite to, so properly denominated slavery, instead of confounding those opposites under one common name.

But in my definition the legal definition of slavery? To find such a definition we must go to some slave code. I will take the civil (uncivil) code of Louisiana. "A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs; the master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry and his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing, but what must belong to his master." Here is, in substance, Dr. Webster's definition, "entire subjection to the will of another." Here is, in substance, my definition: the "absolute bondage," and the "motives of self-interest." Does one man hold another, according to the intent of the above law, from benevolent motives, and for the purpose of mere protection? The advocates of sinless slavery will not pretend it. Nor will they pretend that the above definition of legal slavery, describes their sinless slavery. Although a man could not hold another according to the intent of such a law, and be guiltless, still he might hold another under that law, perverting its design, and not only be guiltless, but be worthy of the highest commendation. But such holding would not be slavery, because it would not be such holding as the law contemplates. The legal power conveyed, would be used, but not used by the one who holds it as a master, for any of the purposes specified in the law. The holding would neither be the thing described, nor the thing intended, but its opposite. The thing described and intended, was slavery; but the thing actually taking place, is protection from the wrongs of slavery; I, therefore, maintain that slavery, rightly understood, is sin in itself, sin under all circumstances, and a sin of unparalleled enormity, murder and treason not excepted.

TOO FAST AND TOO FAR.

BY REV. J. T. PETTER.

It is the error of most religious societies, that, in buying lands, building churches, and assuming pecuniary responsibilities, they go too fast and too far. Too fast, for many in these matters anticipate the necessities; they contract for houses and lands, when there is no demand for such facilities, in the circumstances with which they are surrounded. In this matter they run before they are sent,—before called by duty, or urged by necessity. The hired hall, or the old school house, would accommodate their congregation for another year equally well, with the new building, with the additional advantage of that local inspiration which breathes around the cradle of the society, and the spiritual birth place of its members. This advantage is often sufficient to over-balance any disadvantages which may arise from the accommodations of such a place; it is based on the powerful principles of association, and should never be depreciated or disregarded. A disregard of this advantage, has proved fatal to many religious societies. Urged by something short of imperative necessity, to quit the places of their humble origin, they have built and occupied their churches; but when seated in their newly cushioned pews, surrounded by every convenience for sacred worship, they feel the absence of the associations of the past, with which their new edifice is not invested, and sigh for the local inspiration of their former humble sanctuaries.

Again, religious societies go "too fast" in buying and building, before proper securities for payment are provided. The credit system (we say it without any political allusions) is never so disastrous as in its effects on religious corporations. There is no stock so uncertain in its value as that invested in churches; and none so subject to depreciation, as such investments, after the interest which originated them has subsided. And we may add, that there is nothing in which credit is usually so unnecessary, as in building churches, for this reason, that the necessity for church building will bring with it the resources by which such necessity is to be met. But for this, societies cannot wait; they anticipate the object first, and then the means whereby to obtain it. In view of the evils arising from a wholesale disregard of the past, with which their new edifice is not invested, and sigh for the local inspiration of their former humble sanctuaries.

Again, when justified in beginning, religious societies go "too far." When they buy, they buy too much; when they build, they build too much; and when they have an opportunity to borrow, they extend their credit too far. No matter what the original sum contributed, they almost always manage to come out in debt. Even where the sum secured is sufficient to cover the original plan, societies will extend their plan, but that they will come out in debt. Not that they really wish to be in debt, but that they are not afraid to be. They are willing to be indebted a fair proportion of the costs of the house, say one-quarter, or one-third. So that, as their means increase, their debt increases not relatively, but absolutely. They are poor, and do not raise but \$1000, they immediately build for \$1500; if they can raise \$1500, they immediately build for \$2000. Or if they are large and wealthy, and \$10,000 are needed, they build their suitable house of worship, and all this sum is secured at the commencement; they immediately plan an expenditure of one or two thousand upon extra finish and useless decoration, that, as it would seem, they might come out in debt at the close. So almost every society manages to go "too far"—to go beyond their means.

Is this wise? Is it right? However limited their means, would it not be both wiser and better, for every society which must build, to build within their means?—yes, somewhat within them? If \$5000 are secured for building, would it not be better to build for \$4000, and so reserve \$1000 for bell, and lamps, and stoves, and whatever might remain for incidental additions, alterations, and repairs? And with reference to church embellishments, permit us to ask, would it not be better, in many of our larger churches, to reserve a few hundred dollars as a charity fund, than to expend \$500 in erecting for the preacher a marble or mahogany throne?

In closing our article, we must allude to a fallacy which we fear has deceived many. It is that fallacy which credits faith with all this improvidence and imprudence. Its authors run useless hazards, and then fold their arms in confidence, and trust God to deliver them from all their embarrassments. To this we object, because it makes imprudence an evidence of faith, and because it confounds presumptuous improvidence with sober faith in God. Now, would it not be well for men of strong faith in God, whether ministers or laymen, to assume the liabilities of the society themselves, and manifest their confidence by trusting God to relieve them personally, and individually, from the results of their improvidence?

A brilliant reputation, like a mirror held before the sun, dazzles the beholders, who, annoyed by the light, assail the mirror with missiles, in order to destroy it.

A philosopher, who was suffering great bodily pain, exclaimed, "I thank God that my pain is of the body, and not the conscience."

BIOGRAPHICAL.

MARY A. SLEEPER died of consumption, in Concord, N. H., Dec. 15, aged 82. In early life she became a subject of renewed grace, in Bristol, where her parents then resided, and from that time till her death she lived as a Christian. During a long and useful life, she was distinguished by the power of divine grace. She was confined to a sick bed three years and four months. During this protracted illness, she suffered extremely. Indeed, such an instance of physical suffering scarcely to be found in the annals of our death-doomed race. But amid all her sufferings, perfect patience and resignation was strikingly developed in every look, in every word she uttered. Many were the choice expressions which fell from her lips, such as "All is well," "Christ is precious," "I shall soon be at rest," &c. &c. Her day of life has early closed, but closed without a cloud. ISAAC W. HORTLEY.
New Abstead, N. H., Dec. 10.

Sister EMILY S. HUNTLEY left the church militant for the communion of the church triumphant, Dec. 1, aged 15. She was converted at the early age of eight, joined the M. E. Church, lived a worthy and faithful member, and during a long and distressing sickness, manifested strikingly the power of divine grace. She was confined to a sick bed three years and four months. During this protracted illness, she suffered extremely. Indeed, such an instance of physical suffering scarcely to be found in the annals of our death-doomed race. But amid all her sufferings, perfect patience and resignation was strikingly developed in every look, in every word she uttered. Many were the choice expressions which fell from her lips, such as "All is well," "Christ is precious," "I shall soon be at rest," &c. &c. Her day of life has early closed, but closed without a cloud. ISAAC W. HORTLEY.
New Abstead, N. H., Dec. 10.

Widow ADAM STEERIS died in Lancaster, N. H., Oct. 28, aged 79 years. She was converted when fourteen years of age. Her views were remarkable for her good disposition, and as she was so situated that she could not join that church, she never became a member of any. But she loved the Lord and his people; and it was her delight to search the Scriptures, and when her evening failed, she would often desire her friends to read the Bible to her. Her last days were days of peace and great trust in the Lord Jesus Christ. May the glorious angels follow her as she follows her Lord, and prepare to meet her on the shores of a blissful immortality. Lancaster, Dec. 14. H. H. HARTWELL.

Capt. ABEL FARROW died in West Scituate, Nov. 20, aged 85 years, in hope of a glorious immortality and eternal life. His sufferings were very severe, during the closing scene of life, but he bore them with patience and true resignation to the will of God. He trusted in the precious blood of Christ as the only foundation of his hope, saying at intervals, even to the last, "The precious blood of Christ!" "The precious blood of Christ!" Thus passed away one of the loveliest of men, giving us another assurance of the triumph of the cross. Geo. LINCOLN.

Will the Boston Recorder please copy.

Miss LAURA SNOW died in Williamstown, Vt., Nov. 29, in the 23d year of her age. Her passage over the sea of life was somewhat stormy, on account of feeble health, but her fragile bark we believe is now safely moored in the desired haven. Her exit out of time was sudden and unexpected. She was found dead in her bed at about 6 o'clock, A. M. "Many die as suddenly, but not as safe." "That life is long, which answers life's great end." Some four or five years since, sister Laura embraced religion, and became a member of the M. E. Church in this place. Her piety was decided and uniform. She lived beloved and died lamented. May her early departure from this world of care and sin be sanctified to her widowed mother and other relatives. Williamstown, Vt., Dec. 16. D. FIELD.

LAVINIA F. ESTES died in Troy, Me., Sept. 1, aged 17 years. Lavinia was remarkable for her good disposition, and kind and affectionate manners, but did not seek and find the "pearl of great price" till a few weeks before her death, when she renounced the world, and resigned to no sin degree, to a morbid state of the nervous system, yet we believe our loss is her gain. She has gone from us and before us. S. H. BEALE.
Disson, Dec. 1.
Will the Morning Star please copy.

Mr. SUSAN WILLET died in Brunswick, Me., Oct. 29, aged 34 years. Her last sickness (hemorrhage of lungs and its attendant) was short and distressing. Her health had been feeble for a few months, yet she attended public worship on the Sabbath, and was joyful in the privilege of attending class meetings in her beloved church, and her friends before her removal from us. Sister W. had been a worthy and good member of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this place for about nine years; and although her death was not so triumphant as some are, owing, probably, to no sin degree, to a morbid state of the nervous system, yet we believe our loss is her gain. She has gone from us and before us. "To see, and hear, and know,
All she desired or wished below;
Where every hour finds sweet employ,
In that eternal world of joy."

Brunswick, Dec. 18.

D. FULLER.

Sister JERUSA, wife of Dr. Henry Barker, of Dixmont, Me., died Nov. 21, aged 47. She experienced religion when about 17 years old, and joined the M. E. Church, of which she lived a consistent member till her death. Her's was truly a life of Christian sympathy, benevolence, and devotion to God. Many a weary minister, of different churches, have shared her hospitality, the church generally, the afflicted, the poor and needy, of all classes, will heartily unite with me in saying, "This woman was full of good works." Her sufferings were great, during the last few months. Her physical disease was such as to cause some mental aberration and despondency about toward the end of her life. But she beheld the glory of God, and shouted aloud his praise. Blessed be God, she rests from her labors. S. H. BEALE.
Disson, Dec. 1.
Will the Morning Star please copy.

SARAH M. THAYER died Nov. 20, aged 26 years. Her sickness was long and painful, giving her fair warning of her departure, which she seemed to improve well, and left this world for a better in the triumph of faith, thereby giving her holders an evidence of the power of religion.

SIMON P. WAXER died Sept. 22, aged 19 years. He was attacked by the "lock jaw," and died in a few days. He was a good disciple of Jesus Christ; in one whom was no guile. Sister was not fully aware of being near her end, but she lived well, and I have no fears about such when they die.

ELIZABETH FLECH died Oct. 11, aged 57 years. She was a good woman, and lived a life of piety and devotion. She was a member of the M. E. Church, and was a faithful attendant on the Sabbath school. She was a good mother, and a faithful wife. She died in the arms of her Lord, and is now in the presence of her Father in Heaven. S. H. BEALE.
Winchester, N. H., Dec. 15.

Sister SARAH STONE died of consumption, in N. Dennis, Sept. 8, aged 35 years. Her last sickness was long and painful, giving her fair warning of her departure, which she seemed to improve well, and left this world for a better in the triumph of faith, thereby giving her holders an evidence of the power of religion.

AND WHAT NEXT?
A gentleman riding near the city, overtook a well dressed young man, and invited him to a seat in his carriage. "What," said the gentleman to the young stranger, "are your plans for the future?" "I am a clerk," replied the young man, "and my hope is to succeed and get into business for myself." "And what next?" said the gentleman. "Why, I intend to marry, and set up an establishment of my own," said the youth. "And what next?" continued the interrogator. "Why, to continue in business, and accumulate wealth." "And what next?" "To retire from business, and enjoy the fruit of my labors." "And what next?" "If I am of all to die, and I, of course, cannot escape," replied the young man. "And what next?" "And what next?" said the gentleman. "But the young man had no answer to make; he had no purposes that reached beyond the present life. How many young men are in precisely the same condition? Their plans embrace only this life—what pertains to getting wealth and enjoying life. What pertains to the world to come, has no place in all their plans.—Traveller.

Advertisements.

HEDENBERG'S PATENT AIR-TIGHT PARLOR COAL STOVE.

THIS Stove was patented by Mr. F. L. HEDENBERG, of New York, in 1845, and sold by him to a considerable extent in that city, last winter, and gave entire satisfaction to those who used it.

The subscribers have purchased the right to make and vend this Stove in Boston, and having made new and more beautiful patterns, now offer them to the public with the fullest confidence that for parlors and other rooms where little or no pipe is required, they are superior, in point of economy, comfort, and convenience, to any other Stove now in the market.

The principle on which the stove is constructed, will commend it to the judgment of the scientific, while a moment's observation of one in operation will secure the admiration of the practical man.

Purchasers in want of the best and most economical parlor Stove in use, are requested to call and see this Stove in operation, at No. 36 Union St. LEWIS JONES & SON.
Oct. 7.

FURNITURE AND FEATHER WARE-HOUSE.

NOS. 48, 50 & 52, BLACKSTONE STREET.
W. F. & E. H. BRABROOK would inform their friends and customers, that they continue business at their Old Stand, where may be found a good assortment of FURNITURE AND FEATHERS, MATTRESSES, LOOKING GLASSES, &c. Goods packed for Country trade at short notice.
N. B. Best quality LIVE GESE FEATHERS selling very cheap.
Oct. 7.

THE DOMESTIC STOVE.

THE DOMESTIC COOKING STOVE, for burning either Wood or Coal, invented by J. BEARS, has become completely domesticated in the kitchen; and such is the reputation gained by its intrinsic merits that it can be, and is, WARRANTED to give entire satisfaction.

In form compact, but spacious in appearance neat and plain; in construction simple, and repaired with ease. The height adapted for reaching and replacing the numerous vessels with ease. The hearth, enclosing three sides, prevents the garments of the cook from coming in contact with the heated parts of the stove—offers a safe deposit for hot covers—and is never out of place for the dishes in serving up a meal on a cold day.

The furnace is so arranged that the smaller varieties of coal can be burned, and the quantity required is also small. The construction of the grate admits of clearing the Furnace at one operation.

An extensive assortment of the best varieties of Cooking, Parlor, and Office Stoves, wholesale and retail, for sale at No. 19 and 20 North Market street. D. PROUTY & CO.
Oct. 7.

Allen & Noble,

IMPORTERS OF HARDWARE AND CUTLERY.
No. 10 Washington Street, (3 doors from Dock Square,) Boston.
GEORGE ALLEN,
WILLIAM NOBLE.
Dec. 17.

HILL & BRODEHEAD,

BOOKSELLERS, PUBLISHERS AND STATIONERS.
NOS. 17 AND 19 CORNHILL, BOSTON.
HILL & BRODEHEAD keep constantly on hand, and for sale, at lowest prices, a large assortment of Theological, Medical, School and Miscellaneous Books. Also a large variety of Stationery, including Letter, Cap, Pot, Bill, Note and Fancy Papers; Brackets and Book Boards; Drawing and Tracing Papers; Plain, Fancy and Embossed Visiting Cards; Drawing and Writing Pencils; Paints; Camel's Hair Pencils; Indelible Ink; Steel Pens and Penholders, of every variety; Wafers; Sealing Wax; Inkstands and Ink Bottles; Blank, Account, Check and Memorandum Books; Portfolios, &c. &c.
Oct. 22.

BRABROOK & PRUDEN,

FURNITURE AND FEATHER WARE-HOUSE.
N. O. 48 Blackstone, North side, up stairs, between Hanover and Ann Streets, Boston; where may be found a good assortment of Furniture and Feathers, at extremely low prices, such as Carpets, Bureaus, Chairs, Tables, Sofas, Washstands, Toilets, Looking-Glasses, Bedsteads, Cradles, Sinks, Secretaries, &c. &c. Also, a large assortment of Feather Beds, and a large variety of Feather Mattresses, &c. &c. Persons in want will do well to call before purchasing elsewhere, as every article will be sold at the lowest rates; and we shall endeavor, by strict attention to the business, to merit the patronage of the public.

Persons who have not the ready cash, can be accommodated by paying a small advance on delivery of the goods, the remaining payment or payments will be made to suit purchasers.

N. B. Boarding-Houses furnished at short notice. Beds and Bedsteads to let.
Oct. 17.

J. B. Holman,

GENTLEMEN'S FURNISHING STORE AND SUSPENDER MANUFACTORY.
No. 70 Cornhill, Boston.
HATS, CAPS, SH